

To whom it may concern:I have now been a member of the XM family for 10 months and am loving the clarity and power the XM service delivers when compared to FM stations. I find that the XM stations play newer music and is not based on charts or "Top-40" lists but rather what is requested and music like that. Although the traffic and weather channels have not come to my cities yet, I have listened to the other cities channels and have found that this service is almost invaluable if trying to commute. Instead of waiting for the FM stations to stop the song and report on traffic, I just change the channel and hear where all the accidents are. Same principle with weather coverage. During the past 10 months, I have found such a difference from FM with XM, that I almost never listen to FM because the quality is horrible and the programming is more of what they want to hear instead of what I want to hear. My dad recently rode in my car and listened to an XM country station, and when he met with me, he was so enthusiastic about XM that he went to a local retailer and purchase an entire XM setup for his car too. Although I pay a subscription fee to XM every month, I find it to be well worth the money, and don't feel it should be up to the National Association of Broadcasters to hold back what my money can do. Also, on the very foundation of today's market, competition is what makes technology better and by having FM and XM compete on the same level (it has taken a few years for FM to realize XM possibilities) will only make the 2 providers better. This is why I think you should reject the National Association of Broadcaster's Petition 04-160, and allow the FM stations to finally update their technology and playlists.